UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	·			
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,953	11/19/2003	Donald J. Palmer	200312665-1	9024
	7590 09/11/200 CKARD COMPANY	EXAMINER		
	00, 3404 E. HARMON	NGUYEN, LAMSON D		
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		2861	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
	,		09/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/717,953	PALMER ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Lamson D. Nguyen	2861			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
WHIC - External after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE in a sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS cause the application to become ABAND	FION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>American</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowan closed in accordance with the practice under E.	action is non-final.				
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-27</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>10-27</u> is/are withdraw Claim(s) <u>5 and 6</u> is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-4, 7-9</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or					
Applicati	on Papers					
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the deplacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction to the oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1.	pted or b) objected to by the drawing (s) be held in abeyance. On is required if the drawing (s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) D Notice 3) D Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 'No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Sumn Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/717,953

Art Unit: 2861

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Koitabashi et al. (6,474,778).

Koitabashi et al teach a print method comprising :

Claim 1:

- assigning a pattern to a medium, wherein the pattern defines coordinates of a portion of the medium (figure 4 teaches a pattern where to prink black ink, color ink, and a processing liquid)
- applying a fixer to the portion of the medium in the pattern (figure 4 teaches
 applying a processing liquid represented by the large circles, the processing
 liquid in question helps fix the ink dots from bleeding to adjacent ink dots)
- applying ink to a portion of the medium not having a fixer (figure 4 teaches applying color ink represented by the small circles n8 in an area on the medium where there is no processing liquid being applied)

Claim 2:

- designing a layout of a document (figure 4)
- preparing an image of the layout of the document for printing (figure 4)

Page 2

Art Unit: 2861

applying ink to the medium to form the image (figure 4)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koitabashi in view of Kato et al. (6,158,834).

Koitabashi teaches all claimed features of the invention except:

Claim 3:

applying the fixer to the medium before applying the ink to medium

Claim 4:

applying the ink to the medium before applying the fixer to the medium

It is well-known in the art of inkjet printers to apply a processing liquid prior to or after applying a printing ink, as taught by Kato et al. (column 2, lines 25-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the invention of Koitabashi to incorporate the teaching of applying a processing liquid prior to or after application of a printing ink for the purpose of reducing ink bleeding and to improving printing quality.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koitabashi in view of Takeuchi et al. (6,134,025).

Koitabashi teaches all claimed features of the invention except:

(claim 7) 1-bit plane of data of image

It is well-known in the art to have 1-bit plane of image data as taught by Takeuchi et al (figure 4, 1-bit data 36).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Koitabashi to incorporate the teaching of 1-bit plane image data taught by Takeuchi et al for the purpose of producing black and white image.

Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koitabashi in view of Byers et al. (6,378,976).

Koitabashi teaches all claimed features of the invention except:

Art Unit: 2861

 (claim 8) configuring software associated with a computer to prepare the image of the layout of the document for printing

 (claim 9) configuring firmware to prepare the image of the layout of the document for printing

It is well-known in the art to configure software associated with a computer to prepare the image of the layout of the document for printing and configure firmware to prepare the image of the layout of the document for printing as taught by Beyers (column 3, lines 32-33 teach a computer peripheral; figure 1, column 3, lines 32-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Koitabashi to incorporate the teaching of configuring software associated with a computer to prepare the image of the layout of the document for printing and configuring firmware to prepare the image of the layout of the document for printing for the purpose of outlining a printed image on a medium.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-6 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments dated 12.11.06 with respect to claims 1-9 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2861

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lamson D. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-2259. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Luu can be reached on 571-272-7663. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/717,953

Art Unit: 2861

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LAWSON NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 7